

IASSNS-HEP-93/23

hep-ph/9304318

March 1993

Beyond the Standard Model[★]FRANK WILCZEK[†]*School of Natural Sciences**Institute for Advanced Study**Olden Lane**Princeton, N.J. 08540*

ABSTRACT

The standard model of particle physics is marvelously successful. However, it is obviously not a complete or final theory. I shall argue here that the structure of the standard model gives some quite concrete, compelling hints regarding what lies beyond.

As befits a wise and efficient organizer, Bernard Sadoulet called to ask me to give this talk (with the assigned title) long in advance of the conference. Thus when I accepted his invitation it was with a certain sense of unreality. Only when the time came to prepare, did I realize what a difficult chore it was that I had taken on. For, first of all, there have been many many talks at previous conferences on the same subject (that is, with the same assigned title); and secondly, it is not a subject. The first factor makes it a challenge to say anything fresh; but fortunately the second permits considerable flexibility.

★ Invited talk at PASCOS Conference, Nov. 1992, Berkeley

† Research supported in part by DOE grant DE-FG02-90ER40542. WILCZEK@IASSNS.BITNET

What I decided to do, realizing that I would face a mixed audience including many astronomers and specialists in general relativity, was to try to convey in a simple but honest way the most compelling ideas I know that lead one to concrete expectations for physics beyond the standard model. And in judging what was compelling, I tried to put myself into the position of an intelligent and sympathetic but properly skeptical physicist from outside particle physics. If I were such a person, who did not frequently hear particle physics talks, I would not necessarily want to hear what the speaker considered the *newest* or *most exciting* ideas – that is, in practice, whatever the speaker has been working on for the last few months – but rather the *best* and *most compelling* ideas, which might be new and exciting to me, and in any case would be far less likely to prove transient or false.

Accordingly what follows contains neither new analysis of experimental data nor ambitious new theoretical ideas. It is mainly a record of my judgement of what the central clues for physics beyond the standard model are, and an attempt at some pedagogy. Experts looking for the latest bounds on Higgs, top, or neutrino masses should look elsewhere. So too should those interested in the latest wrinkles in superstring or technicolor model building. However even experts might profit by stepping back occasionally for perspective, and I'll try to keep it interesting for them by throwing in a few provocations [1].

Critique of the Standard Model

The standard model of particle physics is based upon the gauge groups $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ of strong, electromagnetic and weak interactions acting on the quark and lepton multiplets as shown in Figure 1.

In this Figure I have depicted only one family (u, d, e, ν_e) of quarks and leptons; in reality there seem to be three families which are mere copies of one another as far as their interactions with the gauge bosons are concerned, but differ in mass. Actually in the Figure I have ignored masses altogether, and allowed myself the convenient fiction of pretending that the quarks and leptons have a definite

chirality – right- or left-handed – as they would if they were massless. (The more precise statement, valid when masses are included, is that the gauge bosons couple to currents of definite chirality.) The chirality is indicated by a subscript R or L. Finally the little number beside each multiplet is its assignment under the U(1) of hypercharge, which is the average of the electric charge of the multiplet. (The physical photon is a linear combination of the diagonal generator of SU(2) and the hypercharge gauge bosons. The physical Z boson is the orthogonal combination.)

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \text{SU}(3) & \times & \text{SU}(2) \times \text{U}(1) \\
 8 \text{ gluons} & & W^\pm, Z \quad \gamma \\
 & & \uparrow \quad \quad \uparrow \\
 & & \text{mixed} \\
 \\
 \text{SU}(3) \\
 \longleftrightarrow \\
 \text{SU}(2) \uparrow \left(\begin{array}{ccc} u_L^r & u_L^w & u_L^b \\ d_L^r & d_L^w & d_L^b \end{array} \right) \frac{1}{6} & & \begin{array}{ccc} (u_R^r & u_R^w & u_R^b) \frac{2}{3} \\ (d_R^r & d_R^w & d_R^b) - \frac{1}{3} \end{array} \\
 \\
 \left(\begin{array}{c} \nu_L \\ e_L \end{array} \right) - \frac{1}{2} & & e_R - 1
 \end{array}$$

FIGURE 1

Figure 1 - The gauge groups of the standard model, and the fermion multiplets with their hypercharges.

Figure 1, properly understood – that is, the standard model – describes a tremendous chunk of physics. The strong interactions responsible for the structure of nucleons and nuclei, and for most of what happens in high energy collisions; the weak interactions responsible for nuclear transmutations; and the electromagnetic interactions responsible in Dirac’s phrase for “all of chemistry and most of physics” are all there, described by mathematically precise and indeed rather similar theories of vector gauge particles interaction with spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ fermions. The standard

model provides a remarkably compact description of all this. It is also a remarkably successful description, with its fundamentals having now been vigorously and rigorously tested in many experiments, especially at LEP. Precise quantitative comparisons between theory and experiment are nothing new for QED and the weak interactions, but if you haven't been paying attention you may not be aware that the situation for QCD has improved dramatically in the last few years [2]. For example phenomenologists now debate over the third decimal place in the strong coupling constant, experiments are now routinely sensitive to two-loop and even three-loop QCD effects, and recent lattice gauge simulations are achieving 10% or better accuracy in the spectrum both for heavy quark and for light quark systems [3].

While little doubt can remain that the standard model is essentially correct, a glance at Figure 1 is enough to reveal that it is not a complete or final theory. The fermions fall into apart into five lopsided pieces with peculiar hypercharge assignments; this pattern needs to be explained. Also the separate gauge theories, which as I mentioned are mathematically similar, are fairly begging to be unified. Let me elaborate a bit on this. The $SU(3)$ of strong interactions is, roughly speaking, an extension of QED to three new types of charges, which in the QCD context are called colors (say red, white, and blue). QCD contains eight different gauge boson, or color gluons. There are six possible gauge bosons which transform one unit of any color charge into one unit of any other, and two photon-like gauge bosons that sense the colors. An important subtlety which emerges simply from the mathematics and which will play an important role in our further considerations is that there are two rather than three color-sensing gauge bosons. This is because the linear combination which couples to all three color charges equally is not part of $SU(3)$. Similarly the $SU(2)$ of weak interactions is the theory of two colors (say green and purple) and features three gauge bosons: the weak color changing ones, which we call W^+ , W^- , and the weak color-sensing one that mixes with the $U(1)$ hypercharge boson to yield Z and the photon γ .

Unification: quantum numbers

Given that the strong interactions are governed by transformations among three colors, and the weak by transformations between two others, what could be more natural than to embed both theories into a larger theory of transformations among all five colors? This idea has the additional attraction that an extra $U(1)$ symmetry commuting with the strong $SU(3)$ and weak $SU(2)$ symmetries automatically appears, which we can attempt to identify with the remaining gauge symmetry of the standard model, that is hypercharge. For while in the separate $SU(3)$ and $SU(2)$ theories we must throw out the two gauge bosons which couple respectively to the color combinations $R+W+B$ and $G+P$, in the $SU(5)$ theory we only project out $R+W+B+G+P$, while the orthogonal combination $(R+W+B)-\frac{3}{2}(G+P)$ remains.

Georgi and Glashow [4] originated this line of thought, and showed how it could be used to bring some order to the quark and lepton sector, and in particular to supply a satisfying explanation of the weird hypercharge assignments in the standard model. As shown in Figure 2, the five scattered $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ multiplets get organized into just two representations of $SU(5)$.

In making this unification it is necessary to allow transformations between (what were previously thought to be) particles and antiparticles of the same chirality, and also between quarks and leptons. It is convenient to work with left-handed fields only; since the conjugate of a right-handed field is left-handed, we don't lose track of anything by doing so, once we disabuse ourselves of the idea that a given field is intrinsically either genuine or "anti".

As shown in Figure 2, there is one group of ten left-handed fermions that have all possible combinations of one unit of each of two different colors, and another group of five left-handed fermions that each carry just one negative unit of some color. (These are the ten-dimensional antisymmetric tensor and the complex conjugate of the five-dimensional vector representation, commonly referred to as the "five-bar".) What is important for you to take away from this discussion is not so much the precise details of the scheme, but the idea that *the structure of the*

standard model, with the particle assignments gleaned from decades of experimental effort and theoretical interpretation, is perfectly reproduced by a simple abstract set of rules for manipulating symmetrical symbols. Thus for example the object RB in this Figure has just the strong, electromagnetic, and weak interactions we expect of the complex conjugate of the right-handed up-quark, without our having to instruct the theory further. If you've never done it I heartily recommend to you the simple exercise of working out the hypercharges of the objects in Figure 2 and checking against what you need in the standard model – after doing it, you'll find it's impossible ever to look at the standard model in quite the same way again.

SU(5): 5 colors RWBGP

10: 2 different color labels (antisymmetric tensor)

$$\begin{array}{llll}
 u_L : & RP, & WP, & BP \\
 d_L : & RG, & WG, & BG \\
 u_L^c : & RW, & WB, & BR \\
 & (\bar{B}) & (\bar{R}) & (\bar{W}) \\
 e_L^c : & GP & & \\
 & () & &
 \end{array}
 \begin{pmatrix}
 0 & u^c & u^c & u & d \\
 & 0 & u^c & u & d \\
 & & 0 & u & d \\
 & * & & 0 & e \\
 & & & & 0
 \end{pmatrix}$$

5: 1 anticolor label

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 d_L^c : & \bar{R}, \quad \bar{W}, \quad \bar{B} \\
 e_L : & \bar{P} \quad \quad \quad (d^c \quad d^c \quad d^c \quad e \quad \nu) \\
 \nu_L : & \bar{G}
 \end{array}$$

$$\boxed{Y = -\frac{1}{3} (R+W+B) + \frac{1}{2} (G+P)}$$

FIGURE 2

Figure 2 - Unification of fermions in SU(5).

Although it would be inappropriate to elaborate the necessary group theory here, I'll mention that there is a beautiful extension of SU(5) to the slightly larger group SO(10), which permits one to unite all the fermions of a family into a single multiplet [5]. In fact the relevant representation for the fermions is a 16-dimensional spinor representation. Some of its features are depicted in Figure 3.

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\pm \pm \pm \pm \pm) : \text{even } \# \text{ of } - \\
& \quad (+ + - | + -) \quad 6 \quad (u_L, d_L) \\
10 : & \quad (+ - - | + +) \quad 3 \quad u_L^c \\
& \quad (+ + + | - -) \quad 1 \quad e_L^c \\
\bar{5} : & \quad (+ - - | - -) \quad \bar{3} \quad d_L^c \\
& \quad (- - - | + -) \quad \bar{2} \quad (e_L, \nu_L) \\
1 : & \quad (+ + + | + +) \quad 1 \quad N_R
\end{aligned}$$

FIGURE 3

Figure 3 - Unification of fermions in SO(10). The rule is that all possible combinations of 5 + and - signs occur, subject to the constraint that the total number of - signs is even. The SU(5) gauge bosons within SO(10) do not change the numbers of signs, and one sees the SU(5) multiplets emerging. However there are additional transformations in SO(10) but not in SU(5), which allow any fermion to be transformed into any other.

In addition to the conventional quarks and leptons the SO(10) spinor contains an SU(3)×SU(2)×U(1) singlet. The corresponding particle has neither strong, weak nor electromagnetic interactions. It plays an important role in the theory of neutrino masses – but that is the topic for another speaker. Larger gauge groups are also possible. The exceptional group E(6) appears naturally in some large classes

of superstring models [6]. The fermions are then found in multiplets containing a lot of excess baggage that must be explained away.

Unification: coupling values

We have seen that simple unification schemes are successful at the level of *classification*; but new questions arise when we consider the dynamics which underlies them.

Part of the power of gauge symmetry is that it fully dictates the interactions of the gauge bosons, once an overall coupling constant is specified. Thus if $SU(5)$ or some higher symmetry were exact, then the fundamental strengths of the different color-changing interactions would have to be equal, as would the (properly normalized) hypercharge coupling strength. In reality the coupling strengths of the gauge bosons in $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ are not observed to be equal, but rather follow the pattern $g_3 \gg g_2 > g_1$.

Fortunately, experience with QCD emphasizes that couplings “run”. The physical mechanism of this effect is that in quantum field theory the vacuum must be regarded as a polarizable medium, since virtual particle-anti-particle pairs can screen charge. Thus one might expect that effective charges measured at shorter distances, or equivalently at larger energy-momentum or mass scales, could be different from what they appear at longer distances. If one had only screening then the effective couplings would grow at shorter distances, as one penetrated deeper insider the screening cloud. However it is a famous fact [7] that due to paramagnetic spin-spin attraction of like charge vector gluons [8], these particles tend to *antiscreen* color charge, thus giving rise to the opposite effect – asymptotic freedom – that the effective coupling tends to shrink at short distances. This effect is the basis of all perturbative QCD phenomenology, which is a vast and vastly successful enterprise. For our present purpose of understanding the disparity of the observed couplings, it is just what the doctor ordered. As was first pointed out by Georgi, Quinn, and Weinberg [9], if a gauge symmetry such as $SU(5)$ is spontaneously broken at some very short distance then we should not expect that the effective

couplings probed at much larger distances, such as are actually measured at practical accelerators, will be equal. Rather they will all have have been affected to a greater or lesser extent by vacuum screening and anti-screening, starting from a common value at the unification scale but then diverging from one another. The pattern $g_3 \gg g_2 > g_1$ is just what one should expect, since the antiscreening or asymptotic freedom effect is more pronounced for larger gauge groups, which have more types of virtual gluons.

FIGURE 4

Figure 4 - The failure of the running couplings, normalized according to $SU(5)$ and extrapolated taking into account only the virtual exchange of the “known” particles of the standard model (including the top quark and Higgs boson) to meet. Note that only with quite recent experiments [14], which greatly improved the precision of the determination of low-energy couplings, did the discrepancy become significant.

The marvelous thing is that the running of the couplings gives us a truly quantitative handle on the ideas of unification, for the following reason. To fix the relevant aspects of unification, one basically needs only to fix two parameters: the scale at which the couplings unite, which is essentially the scale at which the unified symmetry breaks; and their value when they unite. Given these, one calculates three outputs: the three *a priori* independent couplings for the gauge groups in $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$. Thus the framework is eminently falsifiable. The miraculous thing is, how close it comes to working (Figure 4).

The unification of couplings occurs at a very large mass scale, $M_{\text{un.}} \sim 10^{15}$ GeV. In the simplest version, this is the magnitude of the scalar field vacuum expectation value that spontaneously breaks $SU(5)$ down to the standard model symmetry $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$, and is analogous to the scale $v \approx 250$ GeV for electroweak symmetry breaking. The largeness of this large scale mass scale is important in several ways.

- It explains why the exchange of gauge bosons that are in $SU(5)$ but not in $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$, which reshuffles strong into weak colors and generically violates the conservation of baryon number, does not lead to a catastrophically quick decay of nucleons. The rate of decay goes as the inverse fourth power of the mass of the exchanged gauge particle, so the baryon-number violating processes are predicted to be far slower than ordinary weak processes, as they had better be.

- $M_{\text{un.}}$ is significantly smaller than the Planck scale $M_{\text{Planck}} \sim 10^{19}$ GeV at which exchange of gravitons competes quantitatively with the other interactions, but not ridiculously so. This indicates that while the unification of couplings calculation itself is probably safe from gravitational corrections, the unavoidable logical next step in unification must be to bring gravity into the mix.

- Finally one must ask how the tiny ratio of symmetry-breaking mass scales $v/M_{\text{un.}} \sim 10^{-13}$ required arises dynamically, and whether it is stable. This is the so-called gauge hierarchy problem, which we shall discuss in a more concrete form a little later.

The success of the GQW calculation in explaining the observed hierarchy $g_3 \gg$

$g_2 > g_1$ of couplings and the approximate stability of the proton is quite striking. In performing it, we assumed that the known and confidently expected particles of the standard model exhaust the spectrum up to the unification scale, and that the rules of quantum field theory could be extrapolated without alteration up to this mass scale – thirteen orders of magnitude beyond the domain they were designed to describe. It is a triumph for minimalism, both existential and conceptual.

(By the way I would like to remark that the running of couplings calculation, although not at all difficult to do in quantum field theory, is technically difficult to formulate directly in string theory. The loop expansion in gauge couplings comes about through addition of the contributions from worldsheets of different topology, so that the ordinary renormalization process involves a coarse-graining over topologically distinct structures. Also in field theory the calculation is most conveniently formulated “off shell”, that is using the concept of virtual particles, which is awkward at best in existing formulations of string theory. It is quite disturbing that such a central, physically transparent calculation should be so troublesome: clearly, some new tools need to be designed.)

However, on further examination it is not quite good enough. Accurate modern measurements of the couplings show a small but definite discrepancy between the couplings, as appears in Figure 4. And heroic dedicated experiments to search for proton decay did not find it [10]; they currently exclude the minimal SU(5) prediction $\tau_p \sim 10^{31}$ yrs. by about two orders of magnitude.

Given the magnitude of the extrapolation involved, perhaps we should not have hoped for more. There are several perfectly plausible bits of physics that could upset the calculation, such as the existence of particles with masses much higher than the electroweak but much smaller than the unification scale. As virtual particles these would affect the running of the couplings, and yet one certainly cannot exclude their existence on direct experimental grounds. If we just add particles in some haphazard way things will only get worse: minimal SU(5) nearly works, so the generic perturbation from it will be deleterious. This is a major difficulty for so-called technicolor models, which postulate many new particles in complex

patterns. Even if some *ad hoc* prescription could be made to work, that would be a disappointing outcome from what appeared to be one of our most precious, elegantly straightforward clues regarding physics well beyond the standard model.

Virtual supersymmetry?

Fortunately, there is a theoretical idea which is attractive in many other ways, and seems to point a way out from this impasse. That is the idea of supersymmetry [11]. Supersymmetry is a symmetry that extends the Poincare symmetry of special relativity (there is also a general relativistic version). In a supersymmetric theory one has not only transformations among particle states with different energy-momentum but also between particle states of different *spin*. Thus spin 0 particles can be put in multiplets together with spin $\frac{1}{2}$ particles, or spin $\frac{1}{2}$ with spin 1, and so forth.

Supersymmetry is certainly not a symmetry in nature: for example, there is certainly no bosonic particle with the mass and charge of the electron. More generally if one defines the *R*-parity quantum number

$$R \equiv (-)^{3B+L+2S} ,$$

which should be accurate to the extent that baryon and lepton number are conserved, then one finds that all currently known particles are *R* even whereas their supersymmetric partners would be *R* odd. Nevertheless there are many reasons to be interested in supersymmetry, of which I shall mention three.

- You will notice that we have made progress in uniting the gauge bosons with each other, and the various quarks and leptons with each other, but not the gauge bosons with the quarks and leptons. It takes supersymmetry – perhaps spontaneously broken – to make this feasible.

- Supersymmetry was invented in the context of string theory, and seems to be necessary for constructing consistent string theories containing gravity (critical string theories) that are at all realistic.

FIGURE 5

Figure 5 - A typical quadratically divergent contribution to the $(\text{mass})^2$ of the Higgs boson, and the supersymmetric contribution which, as long as supersymmetry is not too badly broken, will largely cancel it.

• Most important for our purposes, supersymmetry can help us to understand the vast disparity between weak and unified symmetry breaking scales mentioned above. This disparity is known as the gauge hierarchy problem. It actually raises several distinct problems, including the following. In calculating radiative corrections to the $(\text{mass})^2$ of the Higgs particle from diagrams of the type shown in Figure 5 one finds an infinite, and also large, contribution. By this I mean that the divergence is quadratic in the ultraviolet cutoff. No ordinary symmetry will make its coefficient vanish. If we imagine that the unification scale provides the cutoff, we find that the radiative correction to the $(\text{mass})^2$ is much larger than the final value we want. (If the Higgs field were composite, with a soft form factor, this problem might be ameliorated. Following that road leads to technicolor, which as mentioned before seems to lead us far away from our best source of inspiration.) As a formal matter one can simply cancel the radiative correction against a large bare contribution of the opposite sign, but in the absence of some deeper motivating principle this seems to be a horribly ugly procedure. Now in a supersymmetric theory for any set of virtual particles circulating in the loop there will also be another graph with their supersymmetric partners circulating. If the partners were accurately degenerate, the contributions would cancel. Otherwise,

the threatened quadratic divergence will be cut off only at virtual momenta such that the difference in $(\text{mass})^2$ between the virtual particle and its supersymmetric partner is negligible. Thus we will be assured adequate cancellation if and only if supersymmetric partners are not too far split in mass – in the present context, if the splitting is not much greater than the weak scale. This is (a crude version of) the most important *quantitative* argument which suggests the relevance of “low-energy” supersymmetry.

The effect of low-energy supersymmetry on the running of the couplings was first considered long ago [12], well before the crisis described at the end of the previous section was evident. One might fear that such a huge expansion of the theory, which essentially doubles the spectrum, would utterly destroy the approximate success of the minimal SU(5) calculation. This is not true, however. To a first approximation since supersymmetry is a space-time rather than an internal symmetry it does not affect the group-theoretic structure of the calculation. Thus to a first approximation the absolute rate at which the couplings run with momentum is affected, but not the relative rates. The main effect is that the supersymmetric partners of the color gluons, the gluinos, weaken the asymptotic freedom of the strong interaction. Thus they tend to make its effective coupling decrease and approach the others more slowly. Thus their merger requires a longer lever arm, and the scale at which the couplings meet increases by an order of magnitude or so, to about 10^{16} GeV. Also the common value of the effective couplings at unification is slightly larger than in conventional unification ($\frac{g_{\text{un}}^2}{4\pi} \approx \frac{1}{25}$ *versus* $\frac{1}{40}$). This increase in unification scale significantly reduces the predicted rate for proton decay through exchange of the dangerous color-changing gauge bosons, so that it no longer conflicts with existing experimental limits.

Upon more careful examination there is another effect of low-energy supersymmetry on the running of the couplings, which although quantitatively small has become of prime interest. There is an important exception to the general rule that adding supersymmetric partners does not immediately (at the one loop level) affect the relative rates at which the couplings run. This rule works for particles

that come in complete $SU(5)$ multiplets, such as the quarks and leptons (which, since they don't upset the full $SU(5)$ symmetry, have basically no effect) or for the supersymmetric partners of the gauge bosons, because they just renormalize the existing, dominant effect of the gauge bosons themselves. However there is one peculiar additional contribution, from the supersymmetric partner of the Higgs doublet. It affects only the weak $SU(2)$ and hypercharge $U(1)$ couplings. (On phenomenological grounds the $SU(5)$ color triplet partner of the Higgs doublet must be extremely massive, so its virtual exchange is not important below the unification scale. *Why* that should be so, is another aspect of the hierarchy problem.) Moreover, for slightly technical reasons even in the minimal supersymmetric model it is necessary to have two different Higgs doublets with opposite hypercharges. The net affect of doubling the number of Higgs fields and including their supersymmetric partners is a sixfold enhancement of the asymmetric Higgs field contribution to the running of weak and hypercharge couplings. This causes a small, accurately calculable change in the calculation. From Figure 6 you see that it is a most welcome one. Indeed, in the minimal implementation of supersymmetric unification, it puts the running of couplings calculation right back on the money [13].

Since the running of the couplings with scale is logarithmic the unification of couplings calculation is not terribly sensitive to the exact scale at which supersymmetry is broken, say between 100 Gev and 10 Tev. There have been attempts to push the calculation further, in order to address this question of the supersymmetry breaking scale, but they are controversial. It is not obvious to me that such calculations will ever achieve the resolution of interest. For example, comparable uncertainties arise from the splittings among the very large number of particles with masses of order the unification scale, whose theory is poorly developed and unreliable.

FIGURE 6

Figure 6 - When the exchange of the virtual particles necessary to implement low-energy supersymmetry, a calculation along the lines of Figure 4 comes into adequate agreement with experiment.

In any case, if we are not too greedy the main points still shine through:

- If supersymmetry is to fulfill its destiny of elucidating the hierarchy problem in any straightforward way, then the supersymmetric partners of the known particles cannot be much heavier than the $SU(2) \times U(1)$ electroweak breaking scale, *i.e.* they should not be beyond the expected reach of SSC.
- If we assume this to be the case then the meeting of the couplings takes place in the simplest minimal models of unification, without further assumption – a most remarkable and non-trivial fact.

Thus there are, in my opinion, very good specific reasons to be hopeful about the future of experimental particle physics, if we can summon up the national or international will to pursue it.

One can build on these ideas in several directions. The lightest R-odd particle should be stable on cosmological scales and provides an excellent candidate for the missing matter of cosmology. Supersymmetry provides new mechanisms for CP violation, proton decay, and flavor-changing processes that could come in at experimentally detectable levels.

There are also important questions “beyond the standard model” which the line of thought I’ve presented here does not touch. Among the most obvious are the question of why there are three families and why the masses of fermions and mixings among them are what they are, and the question of whether and how gravity might be united with the other interactions. Superstring theory undoubtedly provides the most promising and substantial tools for an assault on these questions. Unfortunately nothing nearly as concrete and successful as the line of argument developed above has emerged from the very extensive and complicated work on this subject done so far. On the other hand it is important that the simplest, apparently successful “semi-phenomenological” ideas about unification, as discussed above, are not inconsistent with what is known about superstring theory – a highly non-trivial fact, since that theory is tightly constrained.

I hope I’ve been able to convey to you a few core ideas for physics beyond the standard model that can be understood fairly simply and that appear likely to be of permanent value.

REFERENCES

1. The reader may wish to compare S. Dimopoulos, S. Raby, F. Wilczek *Physics Today* Oct. 1991, p. 25ff for a related discussion and additional references.
2. The best source for up-to-date information and references is undoubtedly review talks at the standard international conferences. The recent (June 1992) Aachen conference *Twenty Years of QCD*, ed. Zwirner, should be especially useful when it appears.
3. Recently there has been rather spectacular progress in lattice QCD, so anything other than the latest preprints does not represent the state of the art. See especially G. Lepage, P. Mackenzie, *On the Viability of Lattice Gauge Theory* (Cornell preprint, 1992) and F. Butler, H. Chen, J. Sexton, A. Vaccarino, D. Weingarten *Hadron Mass Predictions of the Valence Approximation to Lattice QCD* IBM report RC 19817 (81402).
4. H. Georgi, S. Glashow *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **32**, 438 (1974).
5. H. Georgi, in *AIP Conference Proceedings* **23**, ed. C. Carlson (AIP Press, 1975).
6. An accessible guide to string model building is B. Greene, *Lectures on String Theory in Four Dimensions*, Cornell preprint CLNS 91-1046 (1991), to appear in the Proceedings of the 1990 Trieste Summer School on High Energy Physics and Cosmology.
7. D. Gross, F. Wilczek *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **30**, 1343 (1973); *Phys. Rev.* **D8**, 3633 (1973); H. D. Politzer *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **30**, 1346 (1973).
8. R. Hughes *Phys. Lett.* **B97**, 246 (1980); *Nucl. Phys.* **B186**, 376 (1981); N. K. Nielsen *Am. J. Physics* **49**, 1171 (1981).
9. H. Georgi, H. Quinn, S. Weinberg *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **33**, 451 (1974).
10. R. Becker-Szendy *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D42**, 2974 (1990); Particle Data Group, *Phys. Lett.* **B239**, 1 (1990).
11. A very useful reprint collection with some historical commentary is S. Ferrara, ed. *Supersymmetry* (2 vols.) (North-Holland/World Scientific, Singapore 1987).

12. S. Dimopoulos, S. Raby, F. Wilczek *Phys. Rev.* **D24**, 1681 (1981); W. Marciano and G. Senjanovic *Phys. Rev.* **D25**, 3092 (1982); M. Einhorn and D. Jones *Nucl. Phys.* **B196**, 475 (1982).
13. U. Amaldi, W. de Boer, H. Furstenau *Phys. Lett.* **B260**, 447 (1991); P. Langacker, M. Luo *Phys. Rev.* **D44**, 817 (1991). See also A. Sirlin *Phys. Lett.* **B232**, 123 (1989); J. Ellis, S. Kelley, D. Nanopoulos *Phys. Lett.* **B249**, 441 (1990).
14. For a proper discussion of the data, see the references quoted in [13].